1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
8	MATTHEW R RUTH,	
9	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. 2:14-CV-01388-BHS-DWC
10 11	v.	ORDER
12	PATRICK GLEBE, RAY GONZALEZ,	
13	Defendants.	
114 115 116 117 118 119 220 221	Plaintiff Matthew R. Ruth, proceeding <i>pro se</i> and <i>in forma pauperis</i> in this 42 U.S.C. §  1983 action, filed a Motion for Production of Exhibits and a Motion for Extension of Time to  File Amended Complaint. Dkt. 42, 45. After review of the Motions and relevant record, the  Court denies both the Motion for Production of Exhibits and the Motion for Extension of Time.  A. Motion for Production of Exhibits  In his Motion for Production of Exhibits, Plaintiff requests copies of the exhibits attached to his original Complaint and Motions for Extension of Time. Dkt. 42. To receive copies from the Court, the requesting party must pay \$0.50 per page. As Plaintiff has not provided the necessary payment, his Motion for Production of Exhibits is denied.	
23   24		
	•	

A review of the docket shows Plaintiff is requesting the Court provide him with 108 pages of exhibits. See Dkt. 8, 8-1, 26, 27. If Plaintiff wishes to receive copies of the exhibits attached to his original Complaint and Motions for Extension of Time, he must submit a check in the amount of \$54.00 made payable to the US District Court. Upon receipt of the check, the Clerk's Office will copy and send the requested pages. **B.** Motion for Extension of Time On November 4, 2015, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Extension of Time requesting an extension to file his amended complaint. Dkt. 45. Plaintiff stated he would not be able to file an amended complaint by November 6, 2015, the date it was due. See Dkt. 33, 38, 45. However, on November 6, 2015, Plaintiff filed his Amended Complaint. Dkt. 47. As Plaintiff timely filed his Amended Complaint, the Motion for Extension of Time is denied as moot. Dated this 16th day of November, 2015. United States Magistrate Judge